

FILED IN 11-140250-000

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

THOMAS D. DEMARTINO,

O R D E R
Civ. No. 10-6176-TC

Plaintiff,

vs.

STATE OF OREGON, et al.,

Defendants.

AIKEN, Chief Judge:

Magistrate Judge Coffin filed his Findings and Recommendation on June 7, 2011. The matter is now before me pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). When a party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore

1 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert.
2 denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

3 Plaintiff has timely filed objections. I have, therefore,
4 given the file of this case a de novo review. I adopt the
5 Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation (doc. 116) as follows:
6 defendants' motions to dismiss (docs. 41, 43, 48, 55, 59, 80) and
7 defendants' motion for summary judgment (doc. 102) are granted.
8 Plaintiff's motions for summary judgment (doc. 73), partial
9 summary judgment (doc. 78), and for preliminary [injunction]
10 (doc. 105) are denied. Plaintiff's claims against all defendants
11 are dismissed in their entirety with prejudice.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated this 26 day of July 2011.

14
15
16 

17 _____
18 Ann Aiken
19 United States District Judge
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28